REMARKS

I. Pending Claims

Prior to the instant amendment, claims 1, 19-22, 25, 28, 31-36, 39-42, 45-48, 51-54, 57-58, 60, 61, 63-66, 69, 72, 75-80, 83-86, 89-92, 95-98, 101-102, 104, 105, 108, and 110-148 were pending, with claims 19, 21, 33-36, 39-42, 57-58, 63, 65, 77-80, 83-86, 101-102, 111-125, and 132 under consideration. Although the Examiner neglected to state the status of claims 1, 20, 22, 25, 28, 31, 32, 45-48, 51-54, 60, 61, 64, 66, 69, 72, 75, 76, 89-92, 95-98, 104, 105, 108, 110, 126-131, and 133-148 in the Office Action dated March 17, 2006, Applicant believes these claims are withdrawn from consideration. By the present amendment, Applicant has canceled claims 1, 20, 64, 126-131, 133, 135, 137, and 139 without prejudice as being drawn to non-elected inventions.

Furthermore, Applicant has amended claim 132 to delete the dependency upon claim 121, in order to avoid having a multiply dependent claim depend upon a multiply dependent claim. The deleted dependency has been added back as new claim 149. No new matter has been added.

Accordingly, upon entry of the present amendment, the status of the pending claims should be as follows:

Pending Claims	19, 21, 22, 25, 28, 31, 32-36, 39-42, 45-48, 51-54, 57-58, 60, 61 63, 65, 66, 69, 72, 75-80, 83-86, 89-92, 95-98, 101-102, 104, 105, 108, 110-125, 132, 134, 136, 138, and 140-149
Claims under Consideration	19, 21, 33-36, 39-42, 57-58, 63, 65, 77-80, 83-86, 101-102, 111-125, 132, and new claim 149
Withdrawn Claims	22, 25, 28, 31, 32, 45-48, 51-54, 60, 61, 66, 69, 72, 75, 76, 89-92, 95-98, 104, 105, 108, 110, 134, 136, 138, and 140-148

In the Office Action dated March 17, 2006, the Examiner asserted that claims 19, 21, 33-36, 39-42, 57-58, 63, 65, 77-80, 83-86, 101-102, 111-125 and 132 were currently pending and under consideration. Applicant respectfully notes, however, that the Examiner omitted to reference the withdrawn claims. Applicant notes that the withdrawn process claims (*i.e.*, claims 22, 25, 28, 31, 32, 45-48, 51-54, 60, 61, 66, 69, 72, 75, 76, 89-92, 95-98, 104, 105, 108, 110, 134, 136, 138, and 140-148) and new claim 149 include all of the limitations of at

least one pending product claim from the elected claim group (Group II as set forth in the Office Action mailed September 20, 2005). Accordingly, upon allowance of an elected product claim, Applicant respectfully requests rejoinder of the process claims incorporating the limitations of an allowed product claim, in accordance with the provisions of M.P.E.P. § 821.04.

II. Double Patenting Rejections

A. U.S. Patent No. 5,750,119

Claims 19, 21, 33-36, 39-42, 63, 65, 77-80, 83-86, 115-118, and 122-125 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 42-48 of the U.S. Patent No. 5,750,119 ("the '119 patent"). The Examiner asserts that while the claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other. Furthermore, the Examiner contends that claims 57, 58, 101, 102, 113, 114, 121, and 132 are obvious over claims 42-48 of the '119 patent in view of Roitt *et al.* (Immunology, 3rd ed. Mosby, London, England, 1993). The Examiner also asserts that claims 111 and 119 are obvious in view of claims 42-48 of the '119 patent in view of Nakatsuwaga (U.S. Patent No. 4,434,788) and further in view of Sela *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,093,607). The Examiner also contends that claims 112 and 120 are obvious over claims 42-48 of the '119 patent in view of Kashdan (U.S. Patent No. 4,795,641) and further in view of Modlin (Surgery, Gynecology and Obstetrics, 1979, 149(5): 751-69).

While not conceding the correctness of the rejection, Applicant submits concurrently herewith a terminal disclaimer under 37 CFR 1.321(c), thus obviating the rejection. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

B. U.S. Patent No. 6,017,544

Claims 19, 21, 33-36, 39-42, 63, 65, 77-80, 83-86, 113, 115-118, 121, 122-125 and 132 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 45-49 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,017,544 ("the '544 patent"). The Examiner asserts that while the claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other. Furthermore, the Examiner contends that claims 57, 58, 101, 102, 113, and 114 are obvious over claims 45-49 of the '544 patent in view of Roitt *et al.* (Immunology, 3rd ed. Mosby, London, England, 1993). The Examiner also asserts that claims 111 and 119 are obvious in view of claims 45-49 of the '544 patent in view of Nakatsuwaga (U.S. Patent No.

4,434,788) and further in view of Sela *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,093,607). The Examiner also contends that claims 112 and 120 are obvious over claims 45-49 of the '544 patent in view of Kashdan (U.S. Patent No. 4,795,641) and further in view of Modlin (Surgery, Gynecology and Obstetrics, 1979, 149(5): 751-69).

While not conceding the correctness of the rejection, Applicant submits concurrently herewith a terminal disclaimer under 37 CFR 1.321(c), thus obviating the rejection. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

C. U.S. Application No. 10/386,775

Claims 19, 21, 33-36, 39-42, 63, 65, 77-80, 83-86, 115-118, and 122-125 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 28-30 of copending U.S. Application No. 10/386,775 ("the '775 application"), filed March 7, 2003. The Examiner asserts that while the claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other. Furthermore, the Examiner asserts that claims 111 and 119 are obvious in view of claims 28-30 of the '775 application in view of Nakatsuwaga (U.S. Patent No. 4,434,788) and further in view of Sela *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,093,607). The Examiner also contends that claims 112 and 120 are obvious over claims 28-30 of the '775 application in view of Kashdan (U.S. Patent No. 4,795,641) and further in view of Modlin (Surgery, Gynecology and Obstetrics, 1979, 149(5): 751-69).

While not conceding the correctness of the rejection, Applicant submits concurrently herewith a terminal disclaimer under 37 CFR 1.321(c), thus obviating the rejection. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

III. Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that the present amendment and remarks be entered and made of record in the instant application. It is submitted that all the outstanding rejections have been obviated or overcome. An allowance of the application is earnestly requested. If any issues remain in connection herewith, the Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigned to discuss the same.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 21, 2006

32,605
Adriane M. Antler (Reg. No.)
JONES DAY
222 East 41st Street
New York, New York 10017
(212) 326-3939

Enclosures